

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or a School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of
March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVI, No. 24

MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1923

WHOLE No. 447



Columbia University

In the City of New York

SUMMER SESSION

July 9 to August 17, 1923



Courses will be offered in many subjects in the different Schools of Columbia University, parallel and equivalent to those of the academic year, counting toward the degrees of A.B., B.S., A.M., M.S., Ph.D., LL.B., M.D., and various diplomas of Teachers College.

GREEK

Elementary Course (=Entrance Greek a)
Professor EUGENE TAVENNER
Xenophon (=Entrance Greek b)
Professor EUGENE TAVENNER

Greek Lyric Poets (College Course)
Dr. CLINTON W. KEYES
Greek Lyric Poets (Graduate Course)
Dr. CLINTON W. KEYES

LATIN

Elementary Course (For Beginners)
Mr. IRVING C. DEMAREST
Caesar, Gallic War (=Entrance Latin 3)
Dr. CLINTON W. KEYES
Vergil, Aeneid I-VI (=Entrance Latin 5)
Mr. IRVING C. DEMAREST
Cicero (=Entrance Latin 4)
Dr. JOHN E. BARSS
Prose Composition (=Entrance Latin 6)
Dr. JOHN E. BARSS
Prose Composition (For Teachers)
Professor WILLIAM STUART MESSER
Prose Composition (For the A.M. Degree)
Professor CHARLES KNAPP

Vergil, Aeneid (Advanced Course)
Professor GORDON J. LAING
Ovid, Metamorphoses
Professor CHARLES KNAPP
Roman Oratory
Professor GORDON J. LAING
The Roman World of Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil
Professor WILLIAM STUART MESSER
Teaching Latin in Secondary Schools
Dr. WREN J. GRINSTEAD
Demonstration Class in Beginning Latin
Dr. WREN J. GRINSTEAD

ANCIENT HISTORY

Ancient History (General Course)
Mr. ROY F. NICHOLS
Assyrian Archaeology
Dr. FREDERICK A. VANDERBURGH

The History of Greece
Professor DONALD MCFAYDEN
The Roman Empire
Professor DONALD MCFAYDEN

People and Latin Grammars

People and Latin grammars have at least one point of resemblance; each possesses individuality. It might appear to the casual observer that the same things could be truthfully said of all Latin Grammars. But, where schoolbooks are concerned, teachers are not merely casual observers. And close scrutiny has revealed to teachers the absolutely individual nature of

CONCISE LATIN GRAMMAR

By BENJAMIN L. D'OOGHE

Latin teachers appreciate and approve of these individual qualities.

Its really concise arrangement
Its choice of examples, most of them from passages read in the High School
Its clearness of statement
Its brief history of the Latin language

Concise Latin Grammar meets every need of the High School student and includes most that is needed for translation usually undertaken in College.

GINN AND COMPANY

70 Fifth Avenue
New York

A NEW FEATURE IN SECOND YEAR LATIN

CAESAR, to the average pupil separated from his one year of Latin study by three months' vacation, is a terrifying proposition. The many puzzling constructions for which he has not been prepared by his first year's study soon discourage him. He plods on with difficulty.

The "Training Camp" in **Place's Second Year Latin**, which contains all the Caesar required in second year work, enables the pupil to meet the new constructions and conquer them. Each day's work is definite and prepares specifically for the next day. Attention is concentrated on one thing at a time until it has been mastered. With this training the pupil's victory over Caesar is assured.

SECOND YEAR LATIN

By PERLEY O. PLACE, Litt.D.
Professor of Latin, Syracuse University

576 pages.

Interesting and unusual illustrations

Price, \$1.68

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

Boston

Atlanta

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVI, No. 24

MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1923

WHOLE No. 447

RECENT ADDITIONS TO THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY

To the Loeb Classical Library much space has been devoted in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*: see 5.126-127, 6.82-86, 7.192, 9.49, 12.49-50, 57-58, 65-66, 13.145-147, 153-154, 161-162, 169-170, 15.187-190, 197-199, 215.

In the last year or so important additions were made to the Library.

(1) *Lyra Graeca*: Being the Remains of all the Greek Lyric Poets from Eumelus to Timotheus, Excepting Pindar, translated by J. M. Edmonds, Late Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. This is the first of three volumes. Mr. Edmonds gives a translation of the fragments of Eumelus, Terpander, Alcanan, Sappho, and Alcaeus.

In his Preface (vii) Mr. Edmonds explains that part of his purpose is to supply a new edition of the text of the melic fragments, a text which, thanks to discoveries made during the last forty years, especially through the work of the Egypt Exploration Fund and like Societies, has long been overdue. The last preceding edition, that of Bergk, entitled *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, Mr. Edmonds finds lacking in two respects. First, Bergk quotes too little of the context or setting within which the several fragments are inserted. Mr. Edmonds thinks that, in at least half the cases, the explanations that the fragments so sorely need may be got from the very context in which the fragments are found. Hence, he himself gives the context in full. By so doing, he has earned the gratitude of all students of these fragments; it is to be hoped that this precedent will always be followed by future editors and translators of fragments. My own study of the fragments of Ennius, for example, long ago convinced me of the importance of the context in which fragments are found. Secondly, Mr. Edmonds has included something not to be found in Bergk—the chief passages of ancient literature which throw light on the life and the personality of the poets and their literary reputation in antiquity. Another thing, which Mr. Edmonds describes as a "feature peculiar to this edition", is more likely to provoke discussion and controversy. This feature is "the inclusion of a considerable number of restorations made *exempli gratia* of passages preserved only in paraphrase". These restorations are mainly Mr. Edmonds's own work. Mr. Edmonds explains (ix) that all restorations have been checked wherever possible by a palaeographical method explained and exemplified by him in various articles in classical periodicals.

I can perhaps best give a definite idea of Mr. Edmonds's book by setting down some details about the

pages devoted to Sappho (140-307). The material given is divided into two parts: The Life of Sappho (140-181), and the Poems of Sappho (181-307). In the former part, passages are given, with translations, from Stobaeus, Herodotus, Strabo, Athenaeus, Eusebius, Hermesianax, Ovid, Suidas, Aelian, Seneca, Cicero, Servius, Philostratus, Horace, Plato, the Palatine Anthology, Porphyrio on Horace, Aulus Gellius, Lucian, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Demetrius, etc. Many of these passages tell us next to nothing about Sappho. For example, what is to be learned of her life from Catullus 35.16. . . *Sapphica puella musa doctior?*, or from Horace, *Carm.* 4.9.11. . . *spirat adhuc amor vivuntque commissi calores Aeoliae fidibus puellae?* Such passages are of interest, and of some value, of course, as contributing to the sum total of the impression made by Sappho upon the ancient world, in her own day and later generations, but they give us no definite information concerning her life. Again, it is interesting to learn from Aulus Gellius 19.3 that, in his day and generation, the second century A. D., some musicians at Athens gave delightful renderings not only of a number of the songs of Anacreon and Sappho, but also of some charming erotic elegies: but the passage throws no light on Sappho's life. Still we may be grateful for these passages, even though Mr. Edmonds's caption covering them is to some extent wrong.

A detailed discussion of the text of Sappho's fragments, and of those of the other authors included in this volume, would be entirely beyond the purposes of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*. One may be certain that Mr. Edmonds's text is not likely to go unchallenged, even though scholars have recognized in his articles, and will recognize in this volume, the pains which he has devoted to his work. In *The Classical Review* 36(1922).¹ 120-121, an English reviewer, Mr. E. Lobel, sharply criticizes this volume, as showing, in particular, a lack of "caution, and commonsense, and a critical, especially a self-critical habit". Mr. Lobel sees little, if any, novelty in Mr. Edmonds's vaunted palaeographical method, and hints, besides, that Mr. Edmonds is not loyal to it. To this Mr. Edmonds rejoins caustically in *The Classical Review* 36.159-161.

It should be noted that Mr. Edmonds's translations are all in prose.

Every one is aware that Quintilian 8.6.44 uses Horace *Carmina* 1.14—the famous Ode beginning *O navis, referent in mare te novi fluctus!*—as an illustration of an allegory and that scholars long ago brought the Ode into direct connection with a famous fragment of Alcaeus. See, for instance, the Intro-

ductory note to this Ode of Horace, in the edition of the Odes and Epodes of Horace, by Professor Clifford H. Moore, of Harvard University (pages 100-101), for the text of Quintilian, and part of the text of Alcaeus.

Now, what is preserved of Alcaeus's poem is to be found in Heraclitus, *Homeric Allegories* 37-39. On page 344 of his book, Mr. Edmonds gives the whole context within which the fragment is imbedded. To show his method, and to give some hint of his translation, I quote in full, from page 345, his rendering (it is to be noted that his translation of the context, here as elsewhere throughout the volume, is given in smaller type: I put the rendering of the Alcaeus fragment in double quotation-marks):

Heraclitus *Homeric Allegories*: We shall find the lyric poet of Mytilene using allegory in a considerable number of passages. He likens the disturbances caused by the tyrants very literally to stormy weather at sea:

"I cannot tell the lie of the wind; one wave rolls from this quarter, another from that, and we are carried in the midst with the black ship, labouring in an exceeding great storm. The water is up to the mast-hole, the sail lets daylight through with the great rents that are in it, and the halyards are working loose".

Who hearing this would not conclude immediately from the moving sea-imagery that the fear conveyed by the words is fear of the sea on the part of men aboard ship? Yet it is not so, for the poet means Myrsilus and a monarchical conspiracy hatching against the Mytileneans. And he similarly hints at Myrsilus' intrigues in another place:

"Lo now! the wave that is to windward of us comes this way, and will give us sore labour to bale it out when it breaks over us".

In fact the islander almost overdoes the sea-going in his allegories, likening most of the prevailing tyrant-troubles to storms on the ocean.

For purposes of comparison, I add the rendering of Alcaeus given by Professor Moore:

I do not understand the winds' strife, for the wave rolls, now from this side, now from that, and we with our black ship are carried in the midst, struggling hard with the mighty storm. For the flood surrounds the mast step, the canvass is utterly destroyed, great rents are in it; and the yard-ropes are loosened.

It remains to add that there are a good many textual notes, and many other notes, some giving alternative renderings, some giving references to passages in Greek and Latin authors which throw light upon the fragments.

(2) Philostratus and Eunapius: *The Lives of the Sophists*, by Mrs. Wilmer Cave Wright, Professor of Greek at Bryn Mawr College. Professor Wright is author of a very excellent book, *A Short History of Greek Literature*, and has contributed to the Loeb Classical Library volumes 1 and 2 of the three-volume translation of Julian.

The present volume contains an Introduction (ix-xli); Bibliography (xlii-xliii); Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists*, text and translations (2-315); Eunapius, Introduction (319-339), Bibliography (340-341), *Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists*, text and translations (342-565); Glossary of <Greek> Rhetorical terms

(567-575); Index to Philostratus (576-587); Index to Eunapius (588-596).

In the Introduction to Philostratus, Mrs. Wright gives some account of Philostratus's life and of his works (ix-xv), and then discusses (xv-xxii) the influence of Sophistic in the educational, social, and political life of the Empire in the second and third Christian centuries. On pages xxii-xli Mrs. Wright puts together information about the various sophists named by Philostratus which supplements Philostratus "with dates and facts that he ignored", or corrects his errors. The list of these Sophists is worth while reciting here: Eudoxus of Cnidus, Leon of Byzantium, Dias, Carneades, Philostratus the Egyptian, Dio Chrysostom, Favorinus (mentioned so often by Aulus Gellius), Gorgias of Leontini, Protagoras of Abdera in Thrace, Hippias of Elis, Prodicus of Ceos, Polus of Sicily, Thrasymachus of Chalcedon, Antiphon of the Attic deme Rhamnus, Critias, "the Handsome", Isocrates, Aeschines, Nicetes, Isaeus (mentioned by Pliny and by Juvenal), Scopelian, Dionysius of Miletus, Lollianus of Ephesus, Polemo of Laodicea, Herodes Atticus, Aristocles, pupil of Herodes Atticus, Alexander the Cilician, Hermogenes of Tarsus, Aelius Aristides, Adrian, Julius Pollux of Naucratis, Pausanias, Antipater the Syrian, and Claudius Aelian.

The Introduction to Eunapius is constructed on the same model as that of the Introduction to Philostratus. Among the philosophers of whom Eunapius writes are Plotinus of Lycopolis in Egypt, Porphyry, called "the Tyrian", Iamblichus, Aedesius, Maximus of Ephesus, Priscus the Thesprotian or Molossian, Julian of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Prohaeresius, the Christian Sophist, Epiphanius of Syria, Diophantus the Arab, Sopolis, Himerius, Libanius of Antioch, Acacius of Caesarea, Zeno of Cyprus, Magnus, Oribasius, Chrysanthius, and Hellespontius.

(To be concluded)

C. K.

SOME TRACES OF ROMAN OCCUPATION IN THE RHINE CITIES

The interest which the Rhineland has for the student of Roman archaeology was forcibly presented to me in a short trip which I made through that region last summer. I was, of course, familiar with the principal facts in the history of the Roman occupation of Germany, but did not realize the extent of the archaeological material which remains there.

After visiting the great galleries of Munich, Dresden, and Berlin, I reached the Rhine at Cologne. The city not only keeps its Roman name (*Colonia Agrippinensis*), but the form of the Roman settlement is also preserved by the four nearly straight streets which bound a rectangular section in its center. The short axis of this oblong is parallel to the Rhine. Near the Cathedral, at the northeast corner of the ancient wall, one of the gates remained, partly built into houses, until it was taken down in 1826, when the street was widened. Traces of other gates and towers have

also been found during various building operations. One tower still stands to a height of twenty-five feet above the present ground level at the northwest angle of the wall. It is built of brick-faced concrete. The surface is varied by bands of arches and circles formed of diamond-shaped blocks of stone, more elongated in section than those used in ordinary *opus reticulatum*. The top of the tower is crenellated. The Wallraff-Richartz Museum, which is being reorganized, contains a collection of Roman objects found in the neighborhood. There are remains of mosaic pavements, architectural fragments, sculptures, inscriptions, and some rather fine smaller objects in glass and metal. The collection points to the existence of a prosperous community.

At Bonn (Bonna) there are no extant remains of Roman occupation. A statue of Julius Caesar at the head of the bridge across the Rhine shows that the city is proud of its Roman origin. Caesar's bridge was, however, farther south, in the neighborhood of Coblenz. The Bonn Museum is very well ordered. The smaller objects, dating from prehistoric times (among these is the Neanderthal skull) to the Frankish period, are arranged chronologically, in eight rooms. The collection contains some elegant glass bowls, and vases, and specimens of Roman silver. Sarcophagi, with burials of the Frankish period, show how the heavy jewelry of that time was worn. On a lower floor is housed a group of models representing Roman and earlier Gallic buildings, found or still existing in the Rhine district, and an extensive collection of Roman funeral *stelae*. Some of these are the monuments of women and children, but by far the greater number were erected to the soldiers and the centurions of the legions. The majority of the stones are rather large, so that the deceased is represented by figures in relief almost three-quarters of life size. The figures, standing in a flat niche, above or below which the inscription is carved, are dressed in full uniform. Some stones preserve traces of color. The background was generally dark blue, while scarlet was used freely in the soldier's dress. Occasionally a stele is dedicated to two, father and son together, or to two comrades. Later, in the Cathedral at Mainz, where the monuments of the bishops, placed against the pillars which divide nave from aisles, show the dignitaries standing in full ecclesiastical costume, the whole brilliantly colored, I thought of the monuments of the Roman soldiers at Bonn, and wondered whether these were the source of the later fashion.

From Bonn I went to Coblenz (the Roman Confluentes, of which there are no visible traces). It is interesting to stand at the confluence of the Moselle and the Rhine, and look north, for in that neighborhood was Caesar's bridge, the first path of the Romans into ancient Germany.

To Trèves (Augusta Treverorum) from Coblenz, along the Moselle valley, was a four-hour trip on the main railroad, which does not follow the winding course of the river its entire length, but cuts off part of the distance through tunnels. At times the train is near

enough to the stream to show the clearness of the green depths which Ausonius praised. Fishermen still ply the transparent waters, but the great river traffic of the fourth century has given way before the more expeditious railroad. A small steamer makes the trip in summer. The hills that form the river banks are covered with vineyards to the very summit, and the castles which crown them here and there are probably the successors of Roman villas.

Trèves, the third century capital of Gaul, has, I believe, the most extensive Roman remains of any city in Germany. These serve to show how magnificent a provincial city might be even in the period of Rome's decline. The monumental Porta Nigra, dating from the first half of the third century, is familiar to all. It appeared even more imposing to me than it had seemed in pictures. In the eleventh century the two stories of the left tower were converted into a double Church, the apse of which still remains adjoining the original construction, though all other additions have been removed. Through this gate the Via Decumana passed to the Forum, which occupied the site of the modern marketplace. Nearby is the Cathedral, the oldest Church in Germany, dating from the fourth century. The arched doorway and the adjoining walls are of Roman construction, in squared blocks of local stone. In the northeastern part of the city is a structure known as the basilica. Whatever its original purpose was, the building was used as a palace in the Frankish period, and was converted into a Church in the last century. It is built of brick-faced concrete. The long side is pierced by a double row of nine arched windows. The short side, opposite the entrance, terminates in an apse, so that in general form this building is similar to the contemporary Basilica of Constantine in the Forum at Rome. The basilica at Trèves had originally a hollow tile floor to allow for heating.

Not far from the basilica are ruins popularly called the Palace of Constantine. They are in reality the remains of a Roman bath. Half of the wall of one circular room is standing, to the height of two stories, but crumbling, so that the visitor is warned to be on his guard against falling stones. The walls are faced with mixed brick and stone, variously arranged in different parts of the building. Excavations are now in progress to lay bare the foundations of the entire structure, which covered a comparatively large area. Beyond the city walls, at the southeast, stood an ancient amphitheater built of small stone blocks. The entire circuit of the wall is preserved to varying heights. Subterranean corridors under the arena are accessible. A second Roman bath, of which the lower courses of the walls only remain, was situated in the southwestern part of the city, near the Moselle, at the point where the Roman bridge crossed the stream. The foundations of the modern bridge, as well as the central arch, are said to be of Roman construction. The provincial museum of Trèves is in process of rearrangement. It contains some interesting fragments of Roman mosaic pavement. Among the sculptures are the relief of a Moselle boat

laden with wine casks, and the so-called 'Igeler Säule'. This is the funeral monument of a family of Secundini, as the inscription tells, and dates from the second century. It was found at the village of Igel, near Trèves, where it stood until recently. The monument is seventy feet high, and is formed of a succession of rectangular plinths crowned by a pyramid, which probably served as the base for a statue.

Returning to Coblenz from Trèves, I took the Rhine steamer to Mainz (Magontiacum). The only Roman monument in situ in this city is a huge cylindrical concrete core, fifty feet high (originally higher), which stands at the upper level of the citadel. This fort is now held by the French troops of the army of occupation. The Roman monument is identified as that erected by the legionaries to the elder Drusus, who died in this region in 9 B. C. Mainz was also the scene of the murder of Alexander Severus and his mother, Julia Mamaea, in 235 A. D.

The Roman-Germanic Central Museum at Mainz has a collection of the antiquities of the region. There are numerous prehistoric weapons and implements, and interesting reconstructions of the various types of prehistoric dwellings. Among the Roman weapons are several specimens of metal helmets. Examples of Arretine ware occur in the pottery collection; they show the popularity and diffusion of this style. Fragments of window glass which have been found in the remains of Roman buildings in the locality are also shown. Another case contains a number of Roman shoes, varying, in elaborateness, from the simple sole fastened with leather thongs, to high, laced boots adorned with intricate patterns cut in the leather. The gilt bronze foot and thunderbolt of a statue of Jupiter are kept in the museum. These fragments, together with the column on which the statue stood, were found at Mainz in 1904-1905. The column, dating from the time of Nero, stood thirty feet high. It is composed of two rectangular plinths, surmounted by a shaft of five drums, crowned by a Corinthian capital which supports the base of the statue. Jupiter is represented on one side of the lower plinth, and Minerva and Fortuna on the opposite side. Each of the drums is adorned with the figures of four divinities. These sections, together with the other Roman and medieval sculptures, are now kept temporarily in a building in the court of the Museum. The large model of a Roman bridge, which was formerly displayed, has been destroyed, but many of the blackened timbers with the iron nails which fastened them to form the ancient bridge have been recovered from the river and are shown in the courtyard. Another section of the Museum consists of casts and models of material from other sites; these afford a good opportunity for comparison.

Weisbaden is only a short journey from Mainz across the Rhine valley, into the foothills of the Taunus range. Here was situated a Roman resort known as Aquae Mattiacorum. Part of one of the gates of the ancient wall is visible, and remains of Roman bathing establishments have been found near several of the springs. The Weisbaden Museum is housed in a new

building, and, like most of the German collections, is very well organized. It is especially rich in models showing the different types of Roman fortifications which have been found at various points along the *limes*. It has also life-sized models of Roman and Frankish warriors in full armor. The original objects include extensive prehistoric remains—a large number of stelae of the legionaries, and, among other finds, the contents of an ancient potter's shop as it was when abandoned at the time of the barbarian invasions. A mithraeum discovered at Hedderheim, the ancient Nida, a suburb of Frankfort, has been reconstructed in a separate room.

Nida, on a tributary of the Main, a little to the north of Frankfort, was the Roman city of importance rather than the site of modern Frankfort. Remains of fortifications have been found here. The electric trolley from Frankfort to Bad Homburg passes this town as it ascends into the Taunus region. A ride of an hour beyond Bad Homburg brings us to the ancient Roman border. Here, excavations, begun in 1871, revealed the remains of a Roman camp¹, which has been reconstructed on the original foundations. The region is thickly wooded, and one catches glimpses of the crenellated battlements of the camp from the road which follows the line of the ancient highway. Before the camp, at one side, were found a shrine of Mithras, and a spring which flowed again when it was cleared of rubbish during the excavations. Everything is labelled with bilingual inscriptions in pompous Latin and German. Just before the camp, on either side of the road, there are foundations of houses identified as shops and the other accessories of the settlement.

The wall of the camp is surrounded by a double ditch. We enter by the decuman gate, a double arch, before which there has been placed a modern bronze statue of the Emperor Hadrian, in whose reign the camp was enlarged to its present area. Inside of the wall an earthen agger rises to within about nine feet of the top. Just beyond the gate, at the left, is a small *quaestorium*. At the right are the *horrea*, now used as a museum to house the objects found on the site. In the center of the camp rises the *praetorium*. This structure contains a huge drillroom extending across its entire width. Behind this is the two-story atrium, from the rear of which opens a small sacellum. In the atrium are kept the altars and the stelae found in the neighborhood. Statues of Hadrian and the Severi have been placed in the sacellum.

The entire camp occupies an area equal to about six square city blocks. Several wells, a bath, and a bake-shop with mills were enclosed within the walls. In spite of the absence of the temporary huts of the soldiers, it is easy to picture the life of the camp on the edge of the forest. The little museum contains examples of the weapons and the tools of the soldiers. The latter remind the visitor that the Roman legionary was a builder as well as a fighter. There are also household utensils, children's toys, wearing apparel, *areolae*, and votive statuettes.

¹Miss Franklin has in mind the camp at Saalburg. For this see the CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2.100-102, 247, 9.102. C. K.

On the hill, a little below the camp, a copy of the column to Jupiter, now in the museum at Mainz, with the statue crowning it restored, has been set up and gives an idea of how impressive such a monument was.

Any one of the larger museums in the German cities would be well worth visiting several times. The number of reproductions of the more important objects in each town which are displayed in the larger collections affords an excellent opportunity for close comparison, and the numerous accurate reconstructions help to visualize the life of the Roman camps.

ROME, NOVEMBER, 1922

ERNESTINE P. FRANKLIN

REVIEWS

A History of Rome to 565 A. D. By A. E. R. Boak. New York: The Macmillan Company (1921). Pp. xvi + 444.

This is an outline of Roman history from prehistoric times to the death of Justinian, with a two-page epilogue bringing the narrative to the Mohammedan invasions. Its 400 pages of text, equally apportioned to the Republic and the Empire, are subdivided into four sections: The Forerunners of Rome in Italy (3-21); The Early Monarchy and the Republic: From Prehistoric Times to 27 B. C. (25-201); The Principate or Early Empire: 27 B. C.-285 A. D. (205-313); and The Autocracy or Late Empire: 285-565 A. D. (317-402). The work also contains a Chronological Table (405-413), a Bibliographical Note, including books which represent "the prevailing views of modern scholarship upon the various phases of Roman History" (415-421), and an excellent Index (423-444). There are nine maps, but no other illustrative matter.

The purely scientific character of the book is at once shown by the omission of the early Roman legends. Romulus, whose story constitutes the best known ancient myth, the Kings, the early Latin heroes, the Mons Sacer, are not mentioned. Even the historic Regulus appears under the unfamiliar name Atilius (73). True, we have outlived credence in the early story of Rome, but the constant allusions to it in English literature certainly warrant a passing notice in any general history of Rome. If for no other reason, the traditional account might be briefly outlined to show what the later Romans themselves thought of their early history—even if we cannot follow Ferrero in regarding Varro's date for the founding of the city (753 B. C.) as historical.

In two essentials the work of Professor Boak differs from the Hellenic History of the late Professor Botsford (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 16.124-126). A comparison of these two recent histories by American scholars of note will occur to every teacher of ancient history. While Botsford's work is a symmetrical story of the Greeks, from the viewpoints of politics, economics, society, literature, art, religion, thought, and character—including, in fact, everything which makes up our debt to that many-sided people—, Professor Boak's account is largely political, economic,

and military, with little emphasis on the culture of the Romans. While Botsford devotes one-half of his space to Greek culture, Professor Boak devotes only four out of his twenty-one chapters, or forty-seven pages, to this phase of Rome's greatness, and only four more, or seventy-seven pages, to the constitutional and administrative development of the State. Nor does Professor Boak attempt to give at the bottom of the page the source-material, a feature which enhances the worth of Botsford's book to teacher and advanced student. Nor has the Roman History the charm of the other, and this is not entirely nor even largely due to the more prosaic and practical character of the Romans. In fact, while authoritative and sound throughout, Dr. Boak's work must be adjudged as dry and matter-of-fact; it scarcely ever reaches the romantic and interest-compelling plane of the Hellenic History. This is especially noticeable in the account of Hannibal, whose history is the most soul-stirring episode in Roman history, as told in the pages of Livy, or in that of the tremendous rebel Sertorius, whose life by Plutarch marks the zenith of ancient biography. But, after all, Professor Boak's account is only an outline, and is too succinct for detailed treatment. It is far too condensed to serve as a text-book for a year's work in Roman history in University or College; but it will be found to be an excellent compendium for classes which devote a term or less to the story of Rome.

The work is remarkably free from typographical errors.

Few of Professor Boak's historical judgments can raise adverse criticism; at most they can give rise to a difference of opinion.

To cite a few of these conclusions, let us begin with the question whether Rome was a Latin or an Etruscan colony. Professor Boak (27) is conservative in saying that Rome resulted from a fusion of several racial elements—Latin, Sabine, Etruscan, Pre-Italian, but mostly Latin—the organization into four Regions being due to Etruscan conquerors. And yet the evidence points almost conclusively to Etruscan origin. Thus the names of Rome, of the earliest three tribes, and of all the Kings are Etruscan; the early town was built on an Etruscan model; its primitive art and religion were Etruscan; the early Romans studied Etruscan, just as the later studied Greek (Livy 9.36); and early Rome was hostile to the Latins and destroyed Alba. Moreover, down to the time of the Republic, Rome was a center of industry and commerce, while the Latins were still agriculturalists. Thus, the hypothesis that Rome was an Etruscan town—a belief which, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus says (1.29.2), was widely held in antiquity—is well-founded and is followed by many scholars, e. g. Schulze, K. O. Müller, Soltau, Gardthausen, and Grenier.

Professor Boak says of the commercial treaty with Carthage, which is attested by Polybius (3.22) as made in the first year after the expulsion of the Kings, merely that it "perhaps" dates "from the close of the sixth century" (71-72). And yet this is the earliest certain document in Roman history, even if its his-

toricity has been doubted by some scholars (e. g. E. Täubler, *Imperium Romanum*, 1.1913).

The explanation of the origin of the *tribuni militum consulari potestate* (50-51, 55, and n. 1), as the result of the military situation which frequently demanded the presence in the State of more than two magistrates who could exercise the *imperium*, is probably right, though not generally accepted. The usual explanation, also offered in antiquity, is that the tribunate was created to replace the consulship as an office open to plebeians, who were excluded from the latter, i. e. as a kind of weakened consulship conceded by the patricians to the plebeians. As a matter of fact, as Professor Boak points out, the tribunate appeared in 436 B. C., but it was not until 396 B. C., that a plebeian was elected to it. He might have added that the admission of plebeians probably arose from the vicissitudes of the war with Veii (402-391 B. C.), which forced the patricians to accept as magistrates the ablest men available, even if they were plebeians.

Curiously, Professor Boak does not mention the Licinian-Sextian Rogations, passed in 367 B. C., which helped largely to end the struggle between the patricians and the plebeians. To be sure, one of these, the agrarian law, ordaining that no patrician should possess over 500 iugera of the *ager publicus*, and that all land held in excess of that amount should be distributed (Livy 7.16.9), has been referred to a later century by many scholars, and wholly denied by others, e. g. by Niese (*Hermes* 23 [1888], 416). But the other two clauses, relating to debt and plebeian admission to the consulship respectively, are generally regarded as historical.

The first Samnite War (343-341 B. C.) is also omitted; only two of the three wars (325-304, 298-290 B. C.) are discussed. And yet this first war, however fabulous some of its events, is attested by three ancient writers, Dionysius (15.3.2), Appian (*Roman History* 3.1), and Livy (7.29-37), and it is difficult to see how tradition could have manufactured an entire war. For the difficult questions involved in this obscure war see J. Beloch, *Campanien*², 299-300 (1890).

The tradition repeated in most text-books that the Romans knew so little about ships during the First Punic War that they had to model their fleet after a Carthaginian quinquereme, which had been wrecked on the south Italian coast, is rightly omitted. Rome had long been familiar with warships and merchantmen by this time (circ. 260 B. C.), and, besides, could use the fleets of both her Italian and her Syracusan allies. The only truth in the pretty legend seems to be that, before this time, neither Romans nor Italians understood the use of boats with five banks of oars.

Professor Boak gives the usual explanation of the cause of the Second Punic War (78-79) as Carthaginian expansion in Spain under Hasdrubal, which aroused Massilia and her colonies, whose commercial interests were thereby endangered¹. Hence Rome was invited to intervene. Thus are explained the treaty between

Hasdrubal and Rome in 226 B. C. (that Carthage should not advance in arms north of the Ebro; Polybius 2.13.7, 3.27.9) and Rome's alliance with Saguntum, and Hannibal's resolve to attack. However, even if Saguntum was the occasion, the true cause may well have been the Roman conquest of Cisalpine Gaul. This explains the whole strategic plan of Hannibal's descent into the valley of the Po from the North (see Ferrero, *Short History of Rome*, 1.160-162). The figures for the Roman side at Cannae are very conservative (82): "Of 50,000 Romans and allies, about 25,000 were slain and 10,000 captured by the numerically inferior Carthaginians". Livy (22.49) gives 48,000 as slain and 3,300 as taken prisoners. Polybius (3.117) gives 70,000 infantry as slain out of 73,000 engaged, and 10,000 more as captured, and asserts that of 6,000 cavalry only 370 escaped.

The tradition given by Sallust that the Roman ambassadors headed by Calpurnius were corrupted by Jugurtha's gold in 113 B. C. into making a disgraceful peace is repeated (133). However, the story may be legendary and the consul's peace may have been due to his desire to avoid a war with a man whose only ambition was to get possession of Masinissa's kingdom, an ambition of little moment to Rome.

Mention is made (144) of the secret agreement between Sulla and the consul Valerius Flaccus, who had been sent to replace Sulla in the conduct of the First Mithridatic War. This alone can explain the military history of this war (compare Bernhardt, *Chronologie der Mithridatischen Kriege*, 1896). After his victory at Chaeronea in 86 B. C. Sulla had no idea of yielding to Flaccus, and the latter feared to force the issue. Consequently each agreed to pursue a separate command.

The writing of the story of the Empire offers many more difficulties than that of the Republic. In fact, it has never been fully done. Even Mommsen contented himself with a survey of the culture of the provinces, and his successors in Germany—Schiller, Kornemann, von Domaszewski, and the rest—have done little beyond reducing to system the enormous mass of material from papyri, inscriptions, and coins. Only definite periods have been satisfactorily treated, as the inception of the principate, 78 B. C. to 14 A. D., by Ferrero (*The Greatness and Decline of Rome*, 1-5 [1907-1909]), the first two centuries of the Empire (27 B. C.-180 A. D.), by Professor Bury, *A History of the Roman Empire* (1893), and the last two centuries of the Empire (305-476 A. D.), by Seck (*Geschichte des Untergangs der Antiken Welt*², 1-6 [1897-1920], etc. Considering the difficulty of the subject and the fact that only two hundred pages were available for the task, Dr. Boak has written a remarkably lucid and comprehensive account. If any criticism were to be made, it would be, perhaps, that he has allotted too much space to the personalities of the Emperors, who, with a few notable exceptions, had little influence on the Roman world at large.

Mommsen's well-known idea of an administrative "dyarchy", or joint rule of two independent authorities

¹On this matter see Professor Tenney Frank, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 11.69-71. C. K.

on the basis of the division in 27 B. C. of the provinces between Augustus and the Senate, is accepted (216), although we read, a little further on (225): "Opinions have differed and probably always will differ upon the question whether or not Augustus sought to establish a disguised form of monarchical government". That he founded a monarchy veiled under the old Republican forms has certainly been the prevailing view among modern historians of Rome; but it would have been well to state that quite a different interpretation of Augustus's constitution has been offered in recent years. This new theory was adumbrated first by Fustel de Coulange (*La Gaule Romaine*, 147 f. [1901]), and has been worked out at length by E. Meyer (*Kleine Schriften*, 443-492 [1910]), and at great length by Ferrero in *The Greatness and Decline of Rome*, volumes 4 and 5, especially 4.121-142, 5.348-351. It is based, of course, on Augustus's definition of his own work found in the *Monumentum Ancyranum* (Chapter 34), in a passage which is, perhaps, the most important in that famous document.

The sinister legend handed down by Suetonius and Tacitus about the character of Tiberius, now rightly judged by historians, is, of course, disregarded by Professor Boak, who correctly says (229) that it has obscured the Emperor's real services as a "conscientious and economical administrator". Duruy, in his Latin dissertation (1853), exploded the account of this myth (compare Duruy, *History of Rome and of the Roman People*, edited by Mahaffy [1890], 4.401-402, 482-483, 483, note). The authority to follow for the character of the Emperor is his contemporary, Velleius Paterculus. The vein of madness in Caligula (230) is hardly necessary to assume when we reflect that his every act was in harmony with the idea of absolutism and little was due to insanity. The *Quinquennium Neronis* (232-233) should doubtless be regarded as a cloak for the real intentions of the Emperor, who disliked affairs of government, and gave them over largely to the Senate, desiring to appear and to become a great artist. Professor Boak rightly denies Nero's supposed guilt in the burning of Rome in 64 A. D.

One feature we largely miss in Professor Boak's work, a feature so prominent in Professor Botsford's *Hellenic History*—the series of character-sketches and estimates. There is none, for example, of Hannibal. Of Sulla he merely says that he had "little imagination or constructive ability" (150). Julius Caesar's greatness is very inadequately treated (183-184). Of Augustus we learn merely that his "statemanship <was> of a high order" (225). Antony's cardinal weaknesses are epigrammatically said to be "indolence and sensual indulgence" (190). His relationship to Cleopatra and its effect on the battle of Actium and political events thereafter is well appraised. The fundamental differences in the characters of Diocletian and Constantine might have been brought out. While the former was a powerful and coherent administrator who remained true to the ancient tradition—the "last great man of the ancient world", in the words of

Ferrero (*Short History*, 2.428)—, Constantine, despite great abilities, was ever vacillating in his policy, and deserved the title of "the Great" only at the hands of the Christians, and we are still in doubt how much of a Christian he was.

Professor Boak's literary judgments are frequently inadequate. That Vergil's *Aeneid* has "placed him with Homer in the front rank of epic poets for all time" (299) is certainly an exaggeration. Catullus is not only "the best exponent of the poetry of the age" (199), but one of the three or four greatest lyricists of all time. Nor is Lucretius, one of the most remarkable geniuses, sufficiently praised (199). Cicero gets somewhat more than his due as a thinker, and Caesar somewhat less as a writer (200). That the fourth century A. D. culturally—if not spiritually—belongs to the Middle Ages (304) may be readily granted.

Unfortunately, the account of Christianity is relegated to a point (309-313) where the political story of Rome has passed beyond Diocletian. In fact, Christianity is not mentioned in the account of the first three centuries except once—the brief notice of Nero's persecution (233).

There is little to be said for continuing the story of imperial Rome to the death of Justinian. A far better date is a century and a half earlier, the time of the division of the Empire into East and West at the death of Theodosius (395 A. D.). In any case, the fortunes of the Western Empire should not be carried beyond 476 A. D., the date of the German occupation of Rome. Beyond that is the story of the Eastern Empire—a story all its own.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE

Rome and the World Today. A Study, in Comparison with Present Conditions, of the Reorganization of Civilization under the Roman Empire which Brought to a War-worn World Two Hundred years of Peace. By Herbert S. Hadley. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons (1922). Pp. xvi+362.

The author of this book is a lawyer (Professor of Law, University of Colorado; Former Attorney General and Governor of the State of Missouri). His interests naturally lie almost entirely in the fields of government and law. Furthermore, the book is "frankly a derivative work" (ix), in which little use of original sources is made. It cannot therefore fairly be criticized from the point of view of strict historical or classical scholarship. Neither can it be regarded as purely an attempt to draw certain practical lessons for present-day America from the history of Rome; its secondary purpose which at times seems to overshadow the one indicated in its title, is to demonstrate that Augustus Caesar was the greatest statesman in the history of the world.

The opening chapter, *Have We Anything to Learn from History?* (3-21), is chiefly devoted to pointing out similarities between the Roman civilization and our own, and particularly between the present post-bellum period in America and the Augustan Age of

Rome. The somewhat narrow view taken in this comparison is illustrated by this statement (10): "The chief points of distinction between the civilization and culture of that day and this arise from the use of gasoline and steam engines and electrical power". Yet, the presentation of the similarities in the life of the two ages and nations is impressive. The closing words of the chapter summarize forcefully the chief practical message of the book (20-21): "That Rome, after two hundred years of conquest and aggression, followed by a policy of colonial plunder and oppression; after one hundred years of civil war and strife, followed by bloody proscriptions and a disorganization of industry, commerce, morals, government, and religion, could change her natural purposes and ideals in the lifetime of one generation, and enter upon a mission of civilization and justice that brought peace and prosperity to the western world for two hundred years, constitutes Rome's great message of hopefulness to the twentieth century. . . . If such a work could have been accomplished then, can the world prove unequal to this problem today?"

Chapter II, A Century of War (22-62), and Chapter III, The Coming of Peace (63-101), summarize Roman history up to 29 B. C., with emphasis on the last century of the Republic. The destructive character of the wars, both foreign and civil, and the general disorganization of government and normal life are considerably overemphasized; Rome's contributions to civilization and political science up to the end of the Republic, and the achievements of her leaders, particularly those of Julius Caesar, are correspondingly minimized; and the story of Octavius's rise to power is related in favorable contrast.

Chapters IV-VIII (102-299) are devoted to the principate of Augustus. He is defended against the charge of hypocrisy, and his many achievements are recounted at length. The complete sincerity of his eagerness to revive religion is maintained; the extent and the duration of his power and the enduring success of the form of government instituted by him are emphasized.

Perhaps the most valuable of these interesting chapters is that which summarizes the history of Roman law (VII. Rome's Greatest Gift to the World [213-259]). Here the enormous importance of the reforms instituted by Augustus, particularly in the law of procedure, is clearly shown.

The last chapter (IX. How Socialism Helped to Destroy the Roman Empire [300-342]) is chiefly devoted to what must in general be considered a very sane and sensible consideration of Rome's decline and fall. Among the many suggested causes for the fall of Rome, Professor Hadley is inclined to emphasize the great plague of the age of the Antonines, and the effort to establish morality, a caste system, stable prices, and indeed uniformity in almost every department of life, by means of legislation. But he recognizes the uncertainty of all the theories on the subject in these words of wisdom (339): "After all our explanations, after giving due consideration to all the causes of disintegration and decline, there is something of mystery that baffles comprehension when the spirit, determination and capacity for achievement that has characterized a great people vanish from their lives".

The book is clearly and attractively printed, but is marred by many errors in spelling, especially in Latin

words. Inaccuracies in matters of fact are also not rare. A flagrant example is the description of the government of imperial provinces under Augustus (133, and n. l.), which is completely confused and misleading. And the treatment of slavery under Augustus (163-165) contains some surprising distortions of fact. The statement that "The average period during which one remained a slave was about six years. . . ." (164-165) is surely a very exaggerated conclusion to draw from Cicero, Phil. 8.32, if that is its source. And what is the basis for the conclusion (165) that the evils of slavery "reached their climax under the Republic and declined under the early Empire"? Not a word is said of Augustus's severe limitations on the manumission of slaves!

Professor Hadley's interest in literature and art is not great, and his opinion of their relative importance is made clear by this sentence (258-259): "When it could be truly said that a system of law had been established before which all men were equal, . . . then there came into the world . . . something of greater value than all the literary, artistic, philosophic, and scientific achievements of prior civilizations". It seems unfortunate, then, that he made any attempt to discuss the Augustan literature. The book is greatly marred by such remarks as these (299-302): ". . . . The *Aeneid*. . . puts aside the humble beginning as told in the story of Romulus and Remus . . . and names the great Aeneas, son of Venus as the founder through his son, Julius, of Rome and the Julian line. It tells the story of the struggles and achievements of the Roman people and their great leaders and of the glory and happiness they had finally won under the leadership of Augustus. . . . There is more imagination and idealism in Virgil than in Homer. . . . Compare also this (196): ". . . nobly did he <Horace> respond with the *Carmen Saeculare*, which is the greatest work of this great poet and worthy of the occasion".

It has already been made clear that Professor Hadley is a special pleader for the greatness of Augustus as a statesman. Such exaggeration of his achievements as is found in this book may, however, be necessary if Augustus is ever to gain anything like the fame he surely deserves. The fact (63) that "Gibbon, writing in the republican enthusiasm at the close of the eighteenth century, regarded him as too much of an imperialist, and Mommsen, writing in the imperialistic enthusiasm of nineteenth century Germany, regarded him as too much of a republican" is doubtless a partial explanation of his failure to receive proper credit for his remarkable achievements. Yet a broader reason may lie in human nature. Rulers in times of peace and plenty rarely if ever become great popular heroes; their life-histories do not appeal to the imagination as do those of great military leaders and War-Presidents, particularly if they have suffered violent deaths. Julius Caesar may owe a considerable part of his fame to Shakespeare; yet a playwright's reason for choosing Julius rather than Augustus as the central figure of a drama is obvious to everyone.

But, though Professor Hadley's work may not succeed in adding greatly to the popular reputation of Augustus, it is an extremely interesting description of his time as compared with our own, and will undoubtedly be very useful.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

CLINTON W. KEYES